

Remarks

In the present response, claims 1 – 19 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 1-4, 5-9, 11-13 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,525,932 (Ohnishi) in view of USPN 6,285,833 (Yamane). Claim 14 is rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohnishi in view of Yamane and US 2003/0112325 (Boyden). Claim 10 is rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohnishi in view of Yamane. These rejections are traversed.

Each of the independent claims recites one or more elements that are not taught or suggested in the art. These missing elements show that the differences between the combined teachings in the art and the recitations in the claims are great. As such, the pending claims are not a predictable variation of the art to one of ordinary skill in the art.

As one example independent claim 1 recites that the camera automatically powers on as the camera is ejected from the base portion of the portable computer. The Examiner admits that Ohnishi does not teach this element. Applicants agree with this admission. The Examiner, however, attempts to cure this deficiency with Yamane. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Yamane teaches a camera that uses a single mechanism to control both the pop-up flash and the main power of the camera (see Yamane at col. 3, lines 22-24). A switch located inside the camera actuates upon movement of the pop-up flash. When the switch is activated, the main power of the camera turns on.

In contrast to Yamane, claim 1 recites that the camera automatically powers on “as the camera is ejected from the base portion of the portable computer.” The camera in Yamane is not ejected from a base portion of a portable computer. Power to the camera in Yamane is not activated upon ejection of the camera. Instead, power to the camera in Yamane is activated when a pop-up flash on the camera itself is pushed.

Ohnishi and Yamane do not teach or suggest the claim recitation that a camera automatically powers as the camera is ejected from the base portion of the portable computer. Again, Yamane teaches that the camera powers on when a user pushes a flash pop-up, not as the camera is ejected from another device (i.e., a portable computer).

The differences between the claims and the teachings in the art are great since the references fail to teach or suggest all of the claim elements. As such, the pending claims are not a predictable variation of the art to one of ordinary skill in the art.

For at least these reasons, the claims are allowable over the art of record.

Claim 10 recites automatically powering a camera on while ejecting the camera from inside a cavity located in a computer, and automatically powering the camera off while inserting the camera into the cavity of the computer. Ohnishi in view of Yamane do not teach or suggest these elements.

As noted above, Yamane teaches powering a camera when a user pushes the flash pop-up. Yamane does not suggest automatically powering a camera on while ejecting the camera from inside a cavity located in a computer or automatically powering the camera off while inserting the camera into the cavity of the computer.

The differences between the claims and the teachings in the art are great since the references fail to teach or suggest all of the claim elements. As such, the pending claims are not a predictable variation of the art to one of ordinary skill in the art.

For at least these reasons, independent claim 10 and its dependent claims are allowable over Ohnishi in view of Yamane.

Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 103(a)

Claim 15-16 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,933,981 (Kishida) in view of USPN 5,880,928 (Ma). Claims 18-19 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kishida in view of Ma and Ohnishi. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kishida in view of Ma and Boyden. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kishida in view of Ma and Yamane. These rejections are traversed.

Each of the independent claims recites one or more elements that are not taught or suggested in the art. These missing elements show that the differences between the combined teachings in the art and the recitations in the claims are great. As such, the pending claims are not a predictable variation of the art to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Independent claim 15 recites that the camera is “enclosed inside the computer” when in the first position. By contrast Kishida shows a camera that is located along the

hinge axis on an exterior portion of the computer. Kishida further teaches that the location of the camera is important so the camera can take photographs without moving the entire computer (see column 1, lines 53-57; column 2, lines 30-37).

As another example, claim 15 recites that the camera is in a power-off state while enclosed inside the computer in the first position and automatically transitions to a power-on state as the camera is ejected and physically moves from the first position to the second position. The art of record does not teach this element.

The Examiner cites Yamane for teaching claim 20. Power to the camera in Yamane is activated when a pop-up flash on the camera itself is pushed. The camera in Yamane does not automatically power-on as the camera physically moves. In Yamane, movement of the flash triggers power-on, not movement of the camera. Further, the camera in Yamane does not automatically power-on when it physically moves from being enclosed inside the computer to being ejected and mechanically detached from the computer.

For at least these reasons, independent claim 15 and its dependent claims are allowable over Kishida in view of Ma and Yamane.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to Philip S. Lyren at Telephone No. 832-236-5529. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,

/Philip S. Lyren #40,709/

Philip S. Lyren
Reg. No. 40,709
Ph: 832-236-5529